

- 5 -

Remarks

This is in response to the requirement to restrict dated September 20, 2005. Election between method claim 1 and apparatus claims 2-7 is hereby traversed for the following reasons.

As filed, claim 1 was substantially an identical method analog of apparatus claim 2. Claim 2 has been amended to recite "a plurality of inlets" and now the only difference between the two is that in claim 1, the "porous...filter" is provided and in claim 2, there are "means for" the step of "alternatively providing....". The method of claim 1 cannot be practiced with other than the apparatus of claim 2; the apparatus of claim 2 cannot perform other than the method of claim 1. Furthermore, applicants hereby declare claims 1 and 2 to be obvious one over the other. Therefore, the requirement to restrict must be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



M. P. Williams

Attorney of Record

Voice: 860-649-0305

Fax: 860-649-1385

E-mail: mw@melpat.com

210 Main Street
Manchester, CT 06040

Date: September 27, 2005